

REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Official Action mailed by the Office on 27 May 2005 (hereinafter, the "Action"), and submits this paper as a fully-responsive reply thereto. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action on the subject application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

As a preliminary matter, the Applicant expresses appreciation for the Office's consideration of the Applicant's comments regarding the eligibility of Brothers as a § 102(e) reference, as indicated in the Advisory Action mailed on 18 March 2005 and in the Action. However, the Applicant has reviewed the papers received in connection with both the Advisory Action and the Action, and is unable to locate the copy of the Brothers provisional filing mentioned in the Advisory Action and the Action. The Applicant's comments below do not focus particularly on Brothers. Therefore, the Applicant proceeds with this response assuming that the Brothers provisional filing includes the subject matter relied upon to support the rejections of the Applicant's claims as stated in the Action. However, the Applicant requests a copy of the Brothers provisional filing with the Office's next communication to the Applicant

The Applicant also notes that claims 33-36 and 71-75 have been previously cancelled. However, the Action stated rejections of claims 33-36.

1 Claims 1-7, 10-32, and 37-70 are pending, of which claims 14 and 20 have
2 been amended as indicated in the claim listing above.

3
4 **35 U.S.C. § 103 Claim Rejections**

5
6 As stated in Paragraph 7 of the Action, Claims 1-7, 12, 14-15, 18, 20-25,
7 28, 30-37, 40, 42-54, 57, 59-62, and 65-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
8 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,280 to Farber et al. (hereinafter,
9 “Farber”), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0083178
10 A1 to Brothers (hereinafter, “Brothers”), and of U.S. Patent No. 5,359,659 to
11 Rosenthal (hereinafter, “Rosenthal”). The Applicant respectfully traverses these
12 rejections for the reasons set forth below.

13
14 Turning to **independent claim 1**, the Applicant reproduces claim 1 here for
15 convenience, with emphasis added for ease of discussion:

16
17 **“1. (previously presented) A network system, comprising:**
18 a first device to maintain an original resource;
19 a second device to maintain a replica resource remotely from the first device, the replica
20 resource being replicated from the original resource;
21 memory to store a cached descriptor corresponding to the original resource;
22 a security component to determine whether the replica resource will pose a security risk
23 to the second device upon receipt of a request for the replica resource, wherein the request
24 designates a resource locator, the security component:

1 being configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the
2 second device;

3 formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the
4 formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor; and

5 if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent,
6 formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the
7 formulated descriptor with the second descriptor.”

8
9 Attention is directed to the portions underlined in claim 1 as reproduced
10 above. On page 8, the Office cited Farber, column 31, lines 31-33 against the
11 underlined portions of claim 1 above. For convenience, the Applicant reproduces
12 the relevant portion of the Action here:
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Art Unit: 2131

can be verified and have their integrity check to ensure that they match the stored True Names and any change in a True Name potentially signals corruption in the system and can be further investigated (Farber: inter alia, Column 34 Line 45 – 55). (e) Farber further discloses if an error is found (i.e. the file is corrupted), the system "has the ability to heal itself by finding another source for the True File with the given name (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 31 – 33: This must require formulating a second descriptor (i.e. second True Name // Descriptor) corresponding to the original resource (i.e. another source that holds the original true file) so that the validation of original uncorrupted file can be conducted). Therefore, Farber indeed teaches formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (i.e. True Name of Farber's), and then if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor" (i.e. (d) & (e) as addressed above).

1 For further convenience, column 31, lines 31-33 of Farber, as cited in the Action,
2 are reproduced here, with surrounding text:

3 location from a remote system or removable media.

4 7. Verify True File

5 This mechanism is used to verify that the data item in a
6 True File registry 126 is indeed the correct data item given
7 its True Name. Its purpose is to guard against device errors,
8 malicious changes, or other problems. 30

9 If an error is found, the system has the ability to "heal"
10 itself by finding another source for the True File with the
11 given name. It may also be desirable to verify that the error
12 has not propagated to other systems, and to log the problem
13 or indicate it to the computer operator. These details are not 35
14 described here.

15 To verify a data item that is not in a True File registry 126,
16 use the Calculate True Name primitive mechanism described
17 above.

18 The basic mechanism begins with a True Name, and 40
19 operates in the following steps:

- 20 (A) Find the True File registry entry record 140 corre-
21 sponding to the given True Name.
- 22 (B) If there is a True File ID for the True File registry 45
23 entry record 140 then use it. Otherwise, indicate that no
24 file exists to verify.
- 25 (C) Calculate the True Name of the data item given the file
ID of the data item.
- (D) Confirm that the calculated True Name is equal to the 50
given True Name.
- (E) If the True Names are not equal, there is an error in
the True File registry 126. Remove the True File ID
from the True File registry entry record 140 and place
it somewhere else. Indicate that the True File registry 55
entry record 140 contained an error.

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2 While column 31, lines 31-33 of Farber may refer to a “healing” capability,
3 the Applicant submits that Farber provides scant detail on how this “healing” is
4 performed, aside from “finding another source for the True File with the given
5 name”. Farber is silent as to what this “healing” particularly entails. In light of
6 the limited description provided by Farber, the Applicant respectfully disagrees
7 with the assertion in the Action that Farber’s “healing” capability “must require
8 formulating a second descriptor ... corresponding to the original resource”
9 (emphasis added). Tellingly, the sentence from Farber mentioning the “healing”
10 capability does not reference the “True Name” identifier used throughout Farber’s
11 description. Instead, this sentence uses the term “given name”, and the antecedent
12 for this reference is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, had Farber intended to refer
13 to the True Name identifier in the context of “healing” its system, Farber should
14 have done so clearly.

15
16 The Applicant also notes that Farber describes a “basic mechanism” used in
17 a situation in which a calculated True Name of a data item does not match a given
18 True Name (Farber, column 31, lines 38-56). In this situation, Farber teaches
19 removing an entry from the True File registry entry record 140 and placing it
20 somewhere else (Farber, column 31, lines 53-55). The fact that Farber provides
21 this level of detail in column 31, lines 40-56 in describing an error handling
22 scenario, as compared to the scant treatment given the “healing” teaching in lines
23 31-33 in that same column, further weakens the Office’s interpretation of lines 31-
24 33, and the conclusions drawn therefrom by the Office. Furthermore, Farber’s
25

1 handling of a scenario in which identifiers associated with two data items do not
2 match, as described in column 31, lines 40-55 of Farber, neither teaches nor
3 suggests the features recited in the last paragraph of the Applicant's claim 1.

4
5 Summarizing the foregoing comments, the Applicant submits that Farber
6 fails to teach or suggest at least the features recited in the last paragraph of claim 1
7 for at least two reasons. First, column 31, lines 31-33 of Farber, as cited in the
8 Action, provides insufficient detail to support an interpretation covering the
9 features recited in the Applicant's claim 1. Any motivation or suggestion to read
10 Farber's limited teaching in lines 31-33 so broadly as to support a rejection of the
11 comes only from the Applicant's teachings, and amounts to impermissible
12 hindsight reconstruction or interpretation of the prior art based only on the
13 Applicant's disclosure and claims. Second, other portions of Farber that provide
14 additional detail on Farber's processing, such as column 31, lines 40-56, fail to
15 teach or suggest the features recited in at least the final paragraph of the
16 Applicant's claim 1.

17
18 For at least the foregoing reasons, the Applicant submits that Farber fails to
19 support a § 103 rejection of claim 1 because it does not teach or suggest at least
20 the features recited in the final paragraph of claim 1. The secondary references,
21 Brothers and Rosenthal, are cited against portions of claim 1 other than the final
22 paragraph of claim 1, and are thus not discussed in detail here. The Applicant thus
23 requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claim 1.
24
25

1 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 2-7 and 10-13,
2 which depend from claim 1. Claims 2-7 and 12 stand rejected on the same
3 grounds as does claim 1, while claims 10-11 and 13 stand rejected on different
4 grounds under § 103, and are addressed in more detail below. In any event, the
5 Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of
6 dependent claims 2-7 and 10-13.

7
8 Turning to **independent claim 14**, the Applicant has revised claim 14 to
9 clarify further features of the network server. For convenience, the Applicant
10 reproduces claim 14, with the above revisions shown in redline:

11
12 **14. (currently amended)** A network server, comprising:

13 a server component to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server
14 and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the
15 resource;

16 a memory to store a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource; and

17 a security component that is registerable with the server component during run-time to
18 determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server, the request posing
19 the security risk if the resource has been corrupted and if execution of the resource will
20 compromise the network server, the security component being configured to:

21 formulate a replica descriptor corresponding to a replica of the resource and

22 compare the replica descriptor with the cached descriptor; and
23
24
25

1 if the replica descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulate a
2 second descriptor corresponding to the resource and compare the replica descriptor with
3 the second descriptor.
4

5 The Applicant notes that the features now recited in claim 14 are similar to
6 features previously recited in claim 1, and submits that the revisions to claim 14
7 are fully supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least that basis. Also, because
8 the revisions to claim 14 are similar to features previously recited in claim 1, the
9 Applicant submits that the above comments directed to Farber apply equally to
10 claim 14. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and
11 withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 14.
12

13 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 15-19, which
14 depend from claim 14. Claims 15 and 18 stand rejected on the same grounds as
15 does claim 14, while claims 16-17 and 19 stand rejected on different grounds
16 under § 103, and are addressed in more detail below. In any event, the Applicant
17 requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of dependent
18 claims 15-19.
19

20 Turning to **independent claim 20**, the Applicant has revised claim 20 to
21 clarify further features of the network server system. The revisions to claim 20 are
22 similar to the revisions made to claim 1, and are believed fully supported under §
23 112, 1st paragraph, on at least that basis. Additionally, because the revisions to
24 claim 20 are similar to features previously recited in claim 1, the Applicant
25

1 submits that the above comments directed to Farber apply equally to claim 20. On
2 at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §
3 103 rejection of claim 20.

4
5 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 21-24, which
6 depend from claim 20 and stand rejected on the same grounds as does claim 20.
7 On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the
8 § 103 rejections of dependent claims 21-24.

9
10 Turning to **independent claim 25**, the Applicant reproduces claim 25 here
11 for convenience, with emphasis added to ease discussion:

12
13 “25. (previously presented) A network server, comprising:

14 an Internet server to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server
15 and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the
16 resource;

17 a security component that is registerable with the Internet server during run-time, the
18 security component having:

19 a validation component to *determine whether the request will pose a security risk*
20 *to the network server by determining if a total number of characters defining all of the*
21 *arguments of the request exceeds a maximum number of characters; and*

22 an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a
23 security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request.”
24
25

1 Recall that claim 25 stands rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over
2 Farber in view of Brothers and Rosenthal. Farber clearly does not teach or suggest
3 a security component that is configured to determine whether a request will pose a
4 security risk, as noted in the Action at the bottom of page 5 in stating the rejection
5 of claim 1. Therefore, the Action cited Rosenthal for this teaching in rejecting
6 claim 1, as indicated at the top of page 6 of the Action. However, claim 1 does not
7 include the feature from claim 25 emphasized above. The Applicant also submits
8 that Rosenthal does not provide the teaching missing from Farber that is necessary
9 to support a § 103 rejection of claim 25. More particularly, while Rosenthal
10 pertains to a method for securing software against corruption by computer viruses,
11 the cited portions of Rosenthal does not appear to teach or suggest determining
12 “whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server by determining
13 if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments of the request exceeds
14 a maximum number of characters”, as recited in claim 25. The cited portions of
15 Rosenthal appear to discuss detection of viruses and corruption, but do not
16 recognize or address the issue of checking the number of characters in arguments
17 of a request as a security precaution.

18
19 On at least this basis, the Applicant submits that Farber and Rosenthal, even
20 assuming only for the sake of these comments that they are properly combined
21 under § 103, fail in combination to teach or suggest at least the above features
22 emphasized above in claim 25. Therefore, Farber and Rosenthal fail to support a
23 § 103 rejection of claim 25, and the Applicant requests reconsideration and
24 withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 25 on at least this basis.
25

1 Pending claims 26-32 depend from claim 25, so the above comments apply
2 equally to these dependent claims as well. Claims 28 and 30-32 stand rejected on
3 the same grounds as does claim 25, while claims 26-27 and 29 stand rejected on
4 other grounds discussed in more detail below. In any event, the Applicant
5 requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of dependent
6 claims 26-32.

7
8 Turning to **independent claim 37**, the Applicant reproduces claim 37 here
9 for convenience, with emphasis added to ease discussion:

10
11 “37. (previously presented) One or more computer readable media containing a
12 security application, comprising:

13 a validation component to *determine whether a request for a resource poses a security*
14 *risk by determining if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments of the request*
15 *exceeds a maximum number of characters; and*

16 an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource poses a security
17 risk.”

18
19 The feature emphasized above in claim 37 is similar to the feature
20 discussed in detail above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 25,
21 and the comments above directed to the rejection of claim 25 apply equally here.
22 In the interest of conciseness, these comments are not repeated for claim 37.
23 However, based on similar considerations, the Applicant submits that Farber and
24 Rosenthal, even assuming only for the sake of these comments that they are
25

1 properly combined under § 103, fail in combination to teach or suggest at least the
2 above features emphasized above in claim 37. Therefore, Farber and Rosenthal
3 fail to support a § 103 rejection of claim 37, and the Applicant requests
4 reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 37 on at least this
5 basis.

6
7 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 38-44, which
8 depend from claim 37. Claims 40 and 42-44 stand rejected on the same grounds
9 as does claim 37, while claims 38-39 and 41 stand rejected on different grounds
10 under § 103, and are addressed in more detail below. In any event, the Applicant
11 requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of dependent
12 claims 38-44.

13
14 Turning to **independent claim 45**, the Applicant reproduces claim 45 here
15 for convenience, with emphasis added to ease discussion:

16
17 **“45. (previously presented)** A method, comprising:

18 receiving a request for a replica resource stored on a computing device, the request
19 designating a resource locator having a resource path identifying a location of the replica
20 resource;

21 formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource;

22 comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to an
23 original resource stored on a second computing device remotely located from the computing
24 device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource;

1 determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated
2 descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent;

3 *if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a*
4 *second descriptor corresponding to the original resource;*

5 *comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and*

6 determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated
7 descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent.”

8
9 The feature emphasized above in claim 45 is similar to the feature
10 discussed in detail above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 1,
11 and the comments above directed to the rejection of claim 1 apply equally here. In
12 the interest of conciseness, these comments are not repeated for claim 45.
13 However, based on similar considerations, the Applicant submits that Farber and
14 Brothers, even assuming only for the sake of these comments that they are
15 properly combined under § 103, fail in combination to teach or suggest at least the
16 above features emphasized above in claim 45. Therefore, Farber and Rosenthal
17 fail to support a § 103 rejection of claim 45, and the Applicant requests
18 reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 45 on at least this
19 basis.

20
21 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 46-60, all of which
22 depend ultimately from claim 45. Claims 46-54, 57, and 59-60 stand rejected on
23 the same grounds as does claim 45, while claims 55-56 and 58 stand rejected on
24 different grounds under § 103, and are addressed in more detail below. In any
25

1 event, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103
2 rejections of dependent claims 46-60.

3
4 Turning to **independent claim 61**, the Applicant reproduces claim 61 here
5 for convenience, with emphasis added to ease discussion:

6
7 **“61. (previously presented)** A method, comprising:
8 receiving a request for a resource;
9 implementing security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource;
10 determining whether the request will pose a security risk by *determining if a total number*
11 *of characters defining all of the arguments of the request exceeds a maximum number of*
12 *characters*; and
13 determining whether the resource will pose a security risk if allowing the request.”

14
15 The feature emphasized above in claim 61 is similar to the feature
16 discussed in detail above in connection with the rejection of independent claim 25,
17 and the comments above directed to the rejection of claim 25 apply equally here.
18 In the interest of conciseness, these comments are not repeated for claim 61.
19 However, based on similar considerations, the Applicant submits that Farber and
20 Rosenthal, even assuming only for the sake of these comments that they are
21 properly combined under § 103, fail in combination to teach or suggest at least the
22 above features emphasized above in claim 61. Therefore, Farber and Rosenthal
23 fail to support a § 103 rejection of claim 61, and the Applicant requests
24
25

1 reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 61 on at least this
2 basis.

3
4 These same comments apply equally to pending claims 62-70, which
5 depend from claim 61. Claims 62 and 65-70 stand rejected on the same grounds
6 as does claim 61, while claims 63-64 stand rejected on different grounds under §
7 103, and are addressed in more detail below. In any event, the Applicant requests
8 reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of dependent claims 62-70.

9
10 As stated in Paragraph 8 on page 23 of the Action, claims 10-11, 13, 16-17,
11 19, 26-27, 29, 38-39, 41, 55-56, 58, and 63-64 stand rejected under § 103(a) as
12 being unpatentable over Farber, in view of Brothers, in view of Rosenthal, and in
13 view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0103712 A1 to
14 Rollins, et al. (hereinafter, "Rollins").

15
16 Turning to **dependent claim 10**, this claim depends from claim 1, so all
17 comments directed above to claim 1 apply equally to claim 10. In addition to
18 these comments, however, the Applicant also comments specifically on the
19 rejection of claim 10, as follows.
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 For convenience, the Applicant reproduces claim 10 here, with emphasis
2 added to ease discussion:

3
4 **“10. (previously presented)** A network system as recited in claim 1, wherein the
5 request further designates the resource locator having a resource path, the resource path
6 identifying a location of the replica resource, and *wherein the security component determines that*
7 *the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of*
8 *characters.”*

9
10 As noted above at the beginning of these Remarks, the Applicant has not
11 received a copy of the Brothers provisional application with either the Action or
12 the Advisory Action. Therefore, the Applicant proceeds with these comments
13 based on what is contained in the Action, and reserves further comment on
14 Brothers until the provisional is received.

15
16 Turning to the Action, the Applicant agrees with the assessment on page 24
17 of the Action that Brothers does not disclose expressly that the security component
18 determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not
19 exceed a maximum number of characters. Therefore, the Action cited Paragraph
20 [0087] of Rollins for this teaching.

21
22 Turning to Rollins in more detail, Rollins pertains to a method for securing
23 software against corruption by software viruses. Paragraph [0087] of Rollins
24 introduces a discussion of Address Identifiers. Paragraph [0088] of Rollins
25

1 indicates that the maximum length for a URL is typically two hundred fifty six
2 (256) characters, and also indicates that if the length of a given URL exceeds a
3 specified threshold, then IOM 308 uses an address identifier to reduce the overall
4 size of a modified URL. However, this teaching from Rollins fails to provide
5 what is missing from Brothers to support a § 103 rejection of claim 10.

6
7 Rollins teaches reducing the length of URLs under some circumstances, but
8 fails to teach or suggest any particular reasons for doing so. Rollins also fails to
9 teach or suggest any problems that are overcome by reducing the length of URLs.
10 More specifically, Rollins fails to teach or suggest that a given request “is not a
11 security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of
12 character”, as recited in claim 10. Like Brothers, Rollins does not appear to
13 recognize the security risks associated with resource paths having excessive
14 length, which is the issue dealt with in claim 10. Even if Brothers and Rollins
15 were combined, the resulting system would appear to simply truncate URLs that
16 were over 256 characters in length, but the resulting system would still not assess
17 the security risks associated with such URL lengths. Any motivation to do so
18 comes only from the Applicant’s teaching and claims, and not from the cited art.

19
20 Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant submits that Farber, Brothers,
21 Rosenthal, and Rollins, even assuming only for the sake of these comments that
22 these references are properly combined under § 103, fail in combination to teach
23 or suggest at least the above features emphasized above in claim 10. Therefore,
24 Brothers and Rollins, in particular, fail to support a § 103 rejection of claim 10,
25

1 and the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection
2 of claim 10 on at least this basis.

3
4 Turning to claims 11, 13, 16-17, 19, 26-27, 29, 38-39, 41, 55-56, 58, and
5 63-64, each of these claims are dependent claims, so all comments directed above
6 to their corresponding independent claims apply equally to these dependent
7 claims. To the extent that the rejections of these dependent claims are based on
8 Brothers, the Applicant reserves further substantive comment until a copy of the
9 Brothers provisional is received.

10
11 **Conclusion**

12
13 The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the
14 rejections of pending claims 1-7, 10-32, and 37-70. If any issues remain that
15 preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the
16 undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

17
18 Respectfully Submitted,

19
20 Dated: 23 AUG 03

By: 

Rocco L. Adornato
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 x 257